



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Of course Dr. Conybeare is far from supporting the official optimism of Ivanovski. He sympathizes both with the dissidents and with the sectarians, as almost everybody in Russia does, but I have been unable to find that he gives a definite answer to the main question: how to explain the Raskol. In his introductory chapter he seems to insist on the political and social side of the struggle, following Usov; on p. 262 he adopts the view of Miliukov, which is generally accepted by the leading Russian historians (Kliuchevski, Platonov, etc.). I have been surprised by the way not to find any mention of the views of Kliuchevski, whose treatment of the Raskol forms one of the most brilliant parts of his history of Russia. More definite are the views of Dr. Conybeare on the sects and, while his dealing with the Raskol has not brought forward the question of its nature (except in some minor points), his treatment of the sects is both interesting and stimulating. Here he appears to be in his own domain, and shows with full evidence how closely connected are the Russian sects with many analogous movements in the early history of Christianity.

It was not my intention in pointing out some minor defects of this book to question its value and its importance. There is not very much that is new to Russian scholars, as the study is based on secondary sources, but it should be read by every scholar in America and Western Europe who is interested in religious problems. Russia's religious evolution is as peculiar and as full of interesting phenomena as is everything in the historical evolution of that land.

M. ROSTOVTSSEFF.

Portraits of the Nineties. By E. T. RAYMOND. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1921. Pp. 319. \$4.50.)

FOLLOWING in the footsteps of McCarthy, Russell, and Hutchinson, who have drawn for us the portraits of the English sixties, seventies, and eighties, Mr. Raymond essays a similar task for the final decade of the century. Few will deny his success. His tone is sympathetic and appreciative, a cheering contrast to the mordant criticism of Mr. Keynes and the "Gentleman with the Duster". His appreciation, however, is discriminating and the cloying eulogies of the old-fashioned biographical sketch are wholly lacking. Like most biographical essayists of the moment he seeks, rather too overtly perhaps, to make his impression through humor. Some of his epigrams seem labored; he is often too obviously in search of an anecdote, which sometimes serves and sometimes does not serve to characterize his subject. But of true wit there is not a little, and by his wealth of literary and biographical allusion he has imparted a flavor of nineteenth-century "culture" which more than anything else helps to explain the personalities he presents. He recalls the nineties as, on the whole, a golden age.

The sun shone brighter in those days; the east wind was less

bitter; . . . The steaks were juicier; the landladies were a kindlier race. There was a zest and flavor in life lacking today. Youth was emancipated from the harsher kind of parental control and had not yet found a stern step-father in the State. The world was all before it where to choose and the future was veiled in a rose-colored mist. Such is the atmosphere of the book.

Mr. Raymond has dealt with a host of personalities. No less than twenty-eight are portrayed in separate chapters, while in the final three he brings together groups of lawyers, journalists, and actors for our inspection. The majority of his portraits are of political leaders and his choice would coincide in general with popular judgment; the reader perhaps might be surprised by the inclusion of such men as Earl Spencer, Lord Courtney of Penwith, and Sir Henry Fowler, and by the omission of Bryce, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Ritchie, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, to none of whom has the reviewer been able to discover even an allusion. Cecil Rhodes naturally finds a place, as do Archbishop Temple and Mandell Creighton, Oscar Wilde and Thomas Hardy, artists such as Leighton and Watts, journalists such as Stead, evangelists such as Spurgeon and Booth. The book is in no sense a biographical dictionary; the author avoids dates except as the age of the men under discussion happens to affect their position. There is little of the detailed facts of their careers, which are sketched rapidly and broadly.

In general, popular judgment has been accepted and re-enforced. The writer has little use for the expert analyst who, because of his presence behind the scenes, claims to make final judgment; he puts his confidence in the opinion of the gallery rather than in that of the green-room. "On the whole", he says, "the gallery knows a good play when it sees it and is more than any other part of the house free from the many cranky prepossessions of the moment. . . . It may be too generous when it claps and a trifle unjust when it hisses, but it is honest in both moods." The author is not so much interested, therefore, in a searching analysis of his characters, as he is in showing the impression they made upon their age and what their contemporaries thought of them. "When we can be sure of doing perfect justice in the simplest police case we may begin to talk about the infallibility of a tribunal of pedants. . . . Carry analysis to the length of an autopsy and hero and scoundrel look very much alike." Broadly speaking, then, Mr. Raymond's book is a picture of public opinion rather than a gallery of personalities. It will yield no concrete material for the future doctoral dissertation. It is filled with suggestions, however, and ought not to be neglected by anyone interested in the social and political chronicles of England, particularly of London, at the close of the Victorian era.